

### Remarks

This amendment is submitted under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 in response to the “final” Office Action dated December 23, 2004, wherein claims 1 – 12 were rejected as anticipated by or obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,474,503, to Less, and claims 13 – 14 were allowed. During an interview with the examiner’s supervisor after the Office Action, applicant was informed that independent claims 4 and 8 were also allowable and that claim 1 would be allowable if amended. Accordingly, by this amendment would amend claim 1, as discussed during the interview. Claim 3 has been cancelled since it has been incorporated into claim 1. Claims 1, 2 and 4 – 14 remain pending. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

### Examiner Interview

Upon receipt of the December 23 Office Action, the undersigned immediately try to contact the examiner to discuss it. The examiner’s voicemail stated that he would be out of the office through the end of January, and so the examiner’s supervisor, John Calvert, was contacted and a telephonic interview was conducted on January 18, 2005. After discussing the distinguishing features of the invention with Mr. Calvert, it was agreed that independent claims 4 and 8 were allowable, and that claim 1 would be allowable if further amended along the lines of claims 4 and 8. Applicant wishes to thank Mr. Calvert for the time and attention devoted to this matter.


### Claim Amendment

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the second engagement mechanism is a hook which has a curvature that is generally orthogonal to the plane defined by the collar button. This amendment implements the discussion with Mr. Calvert, described above. Support for the amendment is found in the Application in paragraph [0016] and FIGS. 1 and 3. The referenced paragraph discusses a “plane generally parallel to the collar button” and describes how the hook is orthogonal to this plane. The claimed arrangement is clearly shown in the figures. Entry of the amendment of claim 1 to specify that the second engagement mechanism is a hook would make claim 3 superfluous.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of examiner interview, entry of the foregoing amendment under § 1.116 is appropriate to put the application in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The examiner is invited to call the undersigned, at the telephone number listed below, if doing so might advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



David Schnapf  
Registration No. 31,566

February 7, 2005

SHEPPARD MULLIN  
RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP  
Four Embarcadero Center, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4106  
Telephone (415) 434-9100  
Facsimile (415) 434-3947